<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-12, 14-27, 29 and 30 are pending in the present application.

<u>Rejections Under 35 USC § 103</u>

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 15-19, 21, 22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvez et al. ("Networking, Videoconferencing and Collaborative Environments, 1998) in view of Tucker et al. (US 6,590,604).

With regards to claims 1 and 16, Galvez discloses a virtual room videoconferencing system for transport packets of videoconferencing data (Fig 3), comprising:

a first and second computing device (Fig 3, 1 and 5);

a first reflector (Fig 3,3) connected to said first computing device and a second reflector (Fig 3, "Reflector") coupled to said second computing device;

a video conference web server coupled to said first and second computing devices and enabling the first and second computing devices to participate in a virtual room video conference (at least Page 7)

a communication path formed between the first and second reflectors for communicating video conference data (Fig 3, "Tunnel").

Galvez fails to specifically disclose that the first and second computing devices use different protocols or a gateway coupled to the server and enabled by the server to contact the first computing device.

Tucker discloses a similar system for videoconferencing (Col 2, Lines 46-54) and teaches the use of a gateway (Fig 7,708) to enable conferencing using a first protocol (H.323) (Col 9, Lines 50-54) and a computing device (H.320 gateway) coupled to multiple clients for enabling conferencing between the clients independent of their differing protocols (Col 9, Lines 55-63). These would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Galvez since it would have allowed various clients

using different protocols to conference with each other without requiring the clients to
change any setting or software.

　　　　Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although the Examiner contends that page 7 of
Galvez teaches the use of a video conference web server, a closer examination reveals
that no such teaching is presented. The discussion on page 7 of Galvez is read in
conjunction with Figure 3 of Galvez, which shows a reflector based system that does
not use a video conference web server. The discussion of page 7 relates to the
reflectors of Figure 3 of Galvez, which are referred to as Server/Reflectors in Galvez.
However, in describing their functions, there is no difference between the functions of
the reflectors of Galvez and the reflectors of the present application. However, the
present application (and the amended independent claims) includes teachings to a
video conference server that is distinct from the reflectors. This novel video conference
server provides functionality that was not provided in the cited references.

　　　　Inasmuch as neither Galvez nor Tucker teach, suggest, or describe a video
conference server, the combination of Galvez and Tucker cannot read on a claim that
includes a video conference server that is not a reflector.

　　　　The Examiner has rejected claims 9-12 and 24-17 [sic] under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Galvez et al. in view of Tucker et al. (US 6,590,604) in
further view of DeGollado et al. (US 6,411,623).

　　　　With regard to claims 9 and 24, Galvez discloses a virtual room
videoconferencing system (Fig 3) comprising:
　　　　　a first and second computing device (Fig 3, 1 and 2);
　　　　　a first reflector connected to said first and second computing devices (Fig 3, 3);
　　　　　a video conference web server coupled to said first and second computing
devices and enabling the first and second computing devices to participate in a virtual
room vide [sic] conference (at least page 7).

However, Galvez fails to specifically disclose a first encoder/decoder box connected to the first computing device for encoding/decoding video conference data for the first computing device using said first protocol or a third computing device connected to said first and second computing devices for enabling conferencing independent of the first and second protocols.

Tucker discloses a similar system for videoconferencing (Col 2, Lines 46-54) and teaches the use of a computing device (H.320 gateway) coupled to multiple clients for enabling conferencing between the clients independent of their differing protocols (Col 9, Lines 55-63). These would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Galvez since it would have allowed various clients using different protocols to conference with each other without requiring the clients to change any settings or software.

DeGollado also discloses a similar system for distribution of audio/video data (Col 5, Lines 44-46). DeGollado teaches using a first encoder/decoder box connected to a first and second computing device and a second encoder/decoder box connected to a third computing device (Col 6, Lines 14-36 and Fig 2). This allows the video signals from each device to be encoded for transfer over the network and decoded by the receiving devices.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although the Examiner contends that page 7 of Galvez teaches the use of a video conference web server, a closer examination reveals that no such teaching is presented. The discussion on page 7 of Galvez is read in conjunction with Figure 3 of Galvez, which shows a reflector based system that does not use a video conference web server. The discussion of page 7 relates to the reflectors of Figure 3 of Galvez, which are referred to as Server/Reflectors in Galvez. However, in describing their functions, there is no difference between the functions of the reflectors of Galvez and the reflectors of the present application. However, the present application (and the amended independent claims) includes teachings to a

video conference server that is distinct from the reflectors. This novel video conference server provides functionality that was not provided in the cited references.

Inasmuch as neither Galvez, DeGollado, nor Tucker teach, suggest, or describe a video conference server, the combination of Galvez, DeGollado and Tucker cannot read on a claim that includes a video conference server that is not a reflector.

With respect to the dependent claims, as they are now dependent on allowable base claims, they themselves are allowable.

Applicants file concurrently herewith a REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE) and submit the applicable government filing fees.

Applicants also hereby request a three-month extension of time to file a respond to the outstanding final Office Action to extend the due date for reply to April 17, 2007. Applicants also submit the extension of time fees.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be reexamined and that the claims, as amended, be allowed.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 17, 2007

J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,967
DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300